

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-17 have been pending in the application.

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Barbara Hayes-Roth et al. (U.S. 2002-0005865 A1).

The claims are amended, cancelled without disclaimer or prejudice, and, thus, pending claims remain for reconsideration, which is requested. No new matter has been added.

A telephonic interview was conducted with the Examiner on September 17, 2008.

The Examiner and the Office Action point that the language of claims may be interpreted not to demarcate a dialog control part 303 in relation to a plurality of dialog agents 304 (FIG. 3 of the present Application). In other words, the Office Action alleges that in Hayes-Roth a dialog agent could be interpreted to cover a dialog controller in relation to other dialog agents within the dialog agent, namely paragraph 43 and 45. The Examiner appears to allege that within Hayes-Roth Izzy agent, depending on the state variable Izzy Mood and User Input, each Izzy Mood context (PC1-PC4) can be an invoked content agent to respond (see paragraph 63). Further, in rejecting claim 1, the Office Action relies upon paragraph 78 by asserting that a piece of dialog corresponds to a dialog agent. However, paragraph 78 clearly discusses whether a user's input matches a piece of NLU (Natural Language Understanding), which is data representing words or phrases (see paragraph 77). Therefore, Hayes-Roth's NLU cannot correspond to the claimed "plurality of dialog agents, each changing dialog agent that changes a state in accordance with the input information, changes acceptable input information which the dialog agent is capable of accepting in accordance with the change in the state, and makes generating a response."

Further, the independent claims 1, 15, 16 and 17 are amended to clarify dialog agents 304 in relation to the dialog control part 303 and dialog agents broadcasting capabilities by registration at the dialog control part 303, namely "a dialog agent control part placed that communicates with the dialog agents and the input part, and which intermedates between the dialog agentagents and the input part, which identifies aregisters processing capability information about each of the plurality of the dialog agents by requesting the processing capability information from one or more of the dialog agents, manages transmission of transmits the input information, including the responses of the dialog agents, to the dialog agentagents to request a response to the input informationrespective responses, and transmits a response of processing results from the dialog agentagents to an output part." For example, FIGS. 3-6 and

FIG. 9 and page 9, lines 2-27 and page 10, line 22 to page 12, line 30 (see page 11, lines 4-8) and page 15, line 21 to page 16, line 16, support the claims.

A prima facie case of anticipation based upon Hayes-Roth cannot be established, because there is no evidence that Hayes-Roth, which discusses a matching between an actual context and a potential context in one agent, expressly or inherently (necessarily requires) the claimed “a dialog agent control part placed that communicates with the dialog agents and the input part, and which intermediates between the dialog agentagents and the input part, which identifies aregisters processing capability information about each of the plurality of the dialog agents by requesting the processing capability information from one or more of the dialog agents, manages transmission of transmits the input information, including the responses of the dialog agents, to the dialog agentagents to request a response to the input information respective responses, and transmits a response of processing results from the dialog agentagents to an output part” (e.g., claim 1). In other words, Hayes-Roth does not expressly or inherently (does not necessarily require) the claimed “intermediates between the dialog agentagents and the input part, which identifies aregisters processing capability information about each of the plurality of the dialog agents by requesting the processing capability information from one or more of the dialog agents,” providing a benefit of handling arbitrary inputs based upon the registered processing capabilities of the plurality of dialog agents, namely “dialog control part is notified of selects a dialog agent based upon the registered processing capability acceptable input information indicating input information which of each of the dialog agentagents is capable of accepting in each state, and transmits the input information to the selected dialog agent to receive a response thereto.”

Independent claims 14 and 15 recite features similar to claim 1 and are patentable for similar reasons.

Withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims is requested.

## CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,  
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

/Mehdi D. Sheikerz/

Date: October 16, 2008 By: \_\_\_\_\_

Mehdi Sheikerz  
Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501